Single Bench

3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR [C.G.]

M.C.C. NO.------75----------/2007

Petitioner — Budhwar Singh S/o Bal sai Gond Aged-about 50 yrs. R/o village-Bamhanikhurd, P.O.-Chaitama, Tahsil-Pali, Distt.-Kota [C.G.]

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1-Ministry of Madhya Pradesh govt. Land Revenue Department, Bhopal.

2.Additional Commissioner, Bilaspur division, Bilaspur

3.S.D.O. Katghora

4.Secratry Chhattisgarh govt. Raipur

5.Smt. Nira Bai d/o Palbhawan Singh aged-about 45 years

6.Smt. Dharam Kunwar widow of Palbhawan Singh aged-about 45 years R/o village-Nawapara, tahsil-Pali, Distt.-Korba [C.G.]

7.Ramsharan Singh S/o Harbhajan Singh aged-about 55 years R/o Bamhanikhurd, tah.-Pali, Distt.-Korba [C.G.]

P.R. No. 494/07 Presented by Shri S.K. Sinha dated 24/07

RECEIVED COPY 12/2/07 CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

APPLICATION FOR RESTORATION OF W.P.NO. 325/2001

The above named petitioner most humbly submit

(19)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

M.C.C. No. 75 of 2007

Single Bench:Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.

Petitioner : Budhwar Singh

Versus

Respondents : Ministry of Madhya Pradesh government and others

---

Present: Mr. Sanjay Patel, counsel for the petitioner.
Ms. Sunita Jain, Panel Lawyer for the State.

ORDER

(Passed on 23rd Day of February, 2007)

This is an application for restoration of original Writ Petition No. 325/2001. This petition came-up for hearing before this Court on 9-8-2002. This Court passed the following order:-

> "The defects, as pointed out by the office note dated 12-3-2001 & 23-4-2001 be rectified on or before 26-8-2002, failing which this writ petition shall stands dismissed for non-compliance without further reference to the Bench."

2. The petitioner did not do anything as such, the petition was dismissed for want of prosecution. After dismissal of the petition, the petitioner remained tardy and indolent and did not take any action for a period of about 1600 days. Now, the petitioner has filed an application for condonation of delay. The application for condonation of delay does not disclose any reason which prevented the petitioner from taking any step in filing the application for restoration of the original writ petition.

20

3. Thus, application for condonation of delay does not disclose sufficient reason for condonation of delay.

4. The said application is dismissed. Consequently, the M.C.C. is also dismissed. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Subhash